



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKETT NO.
---------------	-------------	-----------------------	----------------------

08/895,936 7/17/97

Wisniewski

17882-702

EXAMINER	
----------	--

FORD

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3743 25

DATE MAILED:

EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY RECORD

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mr. Mesiti (3) Mr. Ford

(2) Mr. Hutton (4)

Date of interview Jan 4, 02

Type: Telephonic Personal (copy is given to applicant applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: Yes No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement was reached with respect to some or all of the claims in question. was not reached.

Claims discussed: Newly proposed claims 69-89

Identification of prior art discussed: 1992 Article by Wisniewski and (briefly) the Kalthori + Ramadhyani article

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Counsel pointed out A thermal gradient ~~is~~ in Figure 3b which has a downward slope from the edge of the fin toward the wall of the container. This downward gradient was asserted not to occur in the prior art 1992 Wisniewski device because the fins (centrally mounted) do not extend closely enough to the wall. The Examiner expressed

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

His skepticism of this alleged fact and asserted that ~~that~~ at different times during the cooling period the gradient would change and that even in the prior art a downward gradient from the end of the fin toward the wall would eventually develop but admittedly

- 1. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview. Unless the paragraph below has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW (e.g., items 1-7 on the reverse side of this form). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, then applicant is given one month from this interview date to provide a statement of the substance of the interview.
- 2. Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the substance of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

not as quickly as it would develop in a device

Wherein the fin was more closely spaced to the wall, what would the physics change?

Examiner's Signature

PTO-413 (REV. 2-93) ORIGINAL FOR INSERTION IN RIGHT HAND FLAP OF FILE WRAPPER